

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 3, 2005. Claims 1, 6 to 9, 11, 16 to 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32, all of which are independent, have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 6 to 9, 11, 16 to 19, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,519 (Johnson). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns accessing an address book within a communication device, in which data of the address book is accessed in response to operations of a local user interface, and data of the address book is also accessed in response to requests from remote devices on a network. A decision is made whether to permit or deny address book data changing requests for the local and remote accesses. Address book changes are denied for the remote access while a first guide display is displayed on the local user interface (or while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device), even if change of the address book is completed. Address book changes are permitted for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface (or when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen).

Thus, among its many features, the present invention provides for (i) denying address book changes for a remote access while the first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or while a display regarding the address book is being displayed

on an operating screen of the communication device), even if change of the address book is completed, and (ii) permitting address book changes for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface (or when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen).

By virtue of the foregoing, since address book changes are denied for a remote access while a first guide display is displayed on the local user interface (or while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device) even if change of the address book is completed, an operation of the local user interface can be prioritized over an operation which is remote.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, and second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network. The device also includes control means for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the first access means, and from the second access means. In addition, the device includes first display control means for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by a local user to access data of the address book from the first access means. The control means denies address book changes from the second access means while the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface, even if change of the address book is completed by the first access means, and permits address book changes from the second access means when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

Independent Claims 11 and 23 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 1.

Independent Claim 9 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes a local operating unit for accessing data of the address book for a local user via a local user interface, and a remote operating unit for accessing data of the address book for remote users on a network. The device also includes a control unit for deciding to permit or deny address book data changing requests from the local operating unit, and from the remote operating unit. In addition, the device includes a first display control unit for displaying a first guide display on the local user interface, wherein the first guide display is operable by the local user to access data of the address book from the local operating unit. The control unit denies address book changes from the remote operating unit while the first guide is displayed on the local user interface, even if change of the address book is completed by the local operating unit, and permits address book changes from the remote operating unit when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface.

Independent Claims 19 and 24 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 9.

Independent Claim 31 as amended is directed to a communication device having an address book storing data of communication destinations. The device includes first access means for accessing data of the address book in response to operations of a local user interface, and second access means for accessing data of the address book in response to requests from remote devices on a network. The device also includes control means for controlling to permit or prevent changing of the address book, wherein the

control means prevents changing of the address book by the second access means while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device, even if change of the address book is completed by the first access means, and permits changing of the address book by the second access means when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen of the communication device.

Independent Claim 32 as amended is directed to a method which is seen to generally correspond with Claim 31.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, AAPA and Johnson are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (i) denying address book changes for a remote access while the first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device), even if change of the address book is completed, and (ii) permitting address book changes for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface (or when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen).

With reference to the AAPA, the Office Action alleged that the AAPA discloses use of a first guide display which is operable by a local user to access data of an address book, but recognized that the AAPA does not teach the permission or denial of data changing requests. However, the Office Action cited to Johnson for this alleged disclosure.

As understood by Applicants, Johnson discloses a protocol which is stated to allow processes in a distributed environment to access a file either through system calls, e.g. read and write, or through a mechanism that maps the file to their own address space such that the attributes of the files are efficiently and accurately distributed to all of the interested processes. In managing a file size attribute, clients that perform read or write system calls obtain permission to do so from the server of the file by requesting one of the file's multiple read tokens or the file's one write token. Only one client can have the write token at a time. See Johnson, column 6, lines 11 to 35.

The Office Action, at page 3, alleged that the write token in Johnson has the same functionality as the claimed first guide display, since changes to data are denied from a remote access while a local user has the token, and since changes are permitted from the remote access when the local user does not have the token.

However, Johnson is not seen to disclose or suggest that address book changes for a remote access can be denied even if change of the address book associated with the first guide display is completed. As noted above, a write system call in Johnson requires possession of a write token, where only one client can have the write token at a given time, and where the write token is not always necessary to read a file. For example, when a client A in Johnson which had the write token is reading the file after performing a write, a client B can acquire the write token to perform an update. As such, the timing to permit changes by client B is seen to correspond with the timing when a write operation is completed.

In contrast, the timing to permit remote changes in the present invention is seen to correspond more closely to the timing of when display of a first guide display on a

local user interface (or when a display regarding the address book being displayed on an operating screen) is terminated, and not necessarily when change of the address book is completed. For example, in the present invention, remote changes to the address book can be denied while the first guide display is displayed on the local user interface in accordance with reading or writing of the address book.

As such, even if AAPA and Johnson are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (assuming for argument's sake that such combination would be permissible), the result would not teach at least the features of (i) denying address book changes for a remote access while the first guide display is displayed on a local user interface (or while a display regarding the address book is being displayed on an operating screen of the communication device), even if change of the address book is completed, and (ii) permitting address book changes for the remote access when the first guide display is not displayed on the local user interface (or when the display regarding the address book is not being displayed on the operating screen).


Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 23, 24, 31 and 32 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 104140v1